

Paul says RFA was flawed measure *Sponsor of original language, final measure further enabled big government* FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:  
Thursday, June 4, 1998

WASHINGTON - With the people of the United States facing the rising tide of "secular humanism" being offered as the religion-of-choice by courts and the government, and a growing hostility against people of faith, Rep. Ron Paul has taken a stand against a measure which he said led the country in the wrong direction for dealing with the situation.

While a cosponsor of the original legislation, Rep. Paul voted against the Religious Freedom Amendment to the Constitution on Thursday, saying the measure was changed and gave the federal government too much power in over-riding state and local decisions.

"The final version of the Religious Freedom Amendment further enabled the federal government to do more mischief by expanding their powers," said Paul. "Those who have supported the amendment correctly argue that 'rapidly growing government has tried to replace the church, and actually encourages discrimination and hostility against people of faith.' That is absolutely true. However, the proper solution should be to shrink the size of the federal government -- not further enlarge the federal government or impose upon states rules by which they must manage their school districts and property."

Paul said he was disappointed that the measure overstepped the long-standing heritage in the United States of limited government by allowing Congress and the federal courts to further "instruct states and even local school districts on the use of their property -- in direct contrast to the original intent of Constitutional framers to protect against a strong central government and in support of state and local government."

"The only solution is to shrink the government and raise a new generation of judges and congressmen who understand the constitutional principles of original intent, enumerated powers and property rights. If we do this, our existing First Amendment right to freedom of religious expression will be protected more strongly than any effort at federal meddling," said Paul. "Until our judges and our Congress embrace the Constitution, and willingly follows it, new Constitutional amendments will do little to help and will almost certainly make things worse by weakening the already-existing bill of rights."